

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 22-36, and 39-41 are pending. In the present amendment, Claims 20 and 36 are currently amended; Claim 38 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and new Claim 41 is added. Support for the present amendment can be found in the original specification, for example, in Figs. 1 and 2, and in Claim 38. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 20, 22, 23, 26, 27-33, 35, 36, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sufke (U.S. Patent No. 4,739,112) in view of Prase (U.S. Patent No. 2,649,135); Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sufke in view of Prase and Florentin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,965, hereinafter “Florentin”); Claims 24, 25 and 34 were objected to, but were indicated as including allowable subject matter; and Claim 40 was allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable and allowed subject matter in Claims 24, 25, 34, and 40.

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections and traverses these rejections, as discussed below.

Amended Claim 20 recites, in part, “the active position fastening comprises at least one fastening element passing through *the layer of adhesive bonding* between the first and second substrates and engaging in a recess in each of the first and second substrates.” It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest every feature recited in amended Claim 20.

Specifically, the Office Action on page 3 asserts that Sufke “does not disclose the remainder of the claim with regards to the active position fastening.” The Office Action

relies on Prase to cure the deficiencies of Sufke. Prase describes an insulating door panel including upper and lower door frames 2, 15. The door frames 2, 15 include marginal ledges 17, 18 placed on an inside of the frames 2, 15. The ledges 17, 18 are bonded to the respective frames 2, 15 by a film of glue or synthetic resin. A dowel 14 and a key strip 21 (asserted in the Office Action as corresponding to the claimed active position fastening) are disposed as lateral spacers between the frames 2, 15. As shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of Prase, the upper frame 15 is compressed towards the lower frame 2. Thus, the dowel 14 and a key strip 21 are not responsible for *active position fastening* because the dowel 14 and key strip 21 allow the position of the upper frame 15 to move. Further, the dowel 14 and key strip 21 do not pass through a “*layer of adhesive bonding*,” as recited in Claim 20. Instead, the dowel 14 and key strip 21 are merely disposed in grooves formed on ends of a space 22 filled with packaging or filler material. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 20, and all claims which depend thereon, be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 36 is amended to include the features of Claim 38. Accordingly, amended Claim 36 recites, in part, “the active position fastening comprises at least one fastening element passing through *the spacing means* and engaging in a respective recess in each of the first and second substrates.” As discussed above, the dowel 14 and key strip 21 described in Prase do not pass through the “*spacing means*,” as recited in Claim 36. Instead, the dowel 14 and key strip 21 are merely disposed in grooves formed on ends of a space 22 filled with packaging or filler material. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 36 be withdrawn.

Claim 39 depends on Claim 20, and thus is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 20. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Florentin does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Sufke and Prase. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 39 be allowed.

New Claim 41 is added by the present amendment. Support for new Claim 41 can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 9, lines 18-21. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. New Claim 41 depends on Claim 20, and thus is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 20. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that new Claim 41 be allowed.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Adnan H. Bohri
Registration No. 62,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)